

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 3, 2008, has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are currently pending and under examination. By the foregoing amendments, Claim 1 has been amended and new Claims 8 and 9 have been newly added. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, page 4, lines 5-14, and page 8, line 25 to page 10, line 21. No new matter has been introduced.

In the Office Action, Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,704,189 to Collier ("Collier"), Claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,781,990 to Seidler et al. ("Seidler"), and Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidler/Collier in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,267,385 to Okamoto et al. ("Okamoto"). It is noted that Claim 1 has been amended. To the extent that the grounds for rejection remain applicable to the currently pending claims, they are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a process for mounting a plurality of parts to a cable including feeding the cable into a cable-cutting and imprinting machine, marking the cable with information for mounting each of the parts on the cable, the cable being a single unbroken member, the information including mounted positions of each of the parts on the cable, the mounted positions of each of the parts being intermediate between opposite longitudinal ends of the cable in a state where the cable is used, cutting the

cable, by the cable-cutting and imprinting machine, to a predetermined length when the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches the predetermined length, and thereafter mounting each of the parts on the cable at a corresponding mounted position marked on the cable.

Regarding rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), the Office Action alleged that Collier teaches each and every element of Claim 1. More particularly, the Office Action alleged that Collier teaches the step of cutting the cable to a predetermined length when the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches the predetermined length, as shown in col. 3, lines 60-62. Applicants respectfully submit that no disclosure is found in Collier that Collier teaches a cable-cutting and imprinting machine as the claimed invention. The machine 10, as indicated in col. 6, lines 57-61 is only a coding machine used for coding a length of cable 12 passing between code impression rollers 14, 15, each of which contains a characteristic raised encoding die pattern 18, 20. Such machine is only for coding the cable 12 but does not have the function of cutting the cable to a predetermined length. As clearly shown in Figs. 1 and 9, where no cutting device is included in the machine 10. The statement referenced by the Office Action merely indicates that the cable is cut, but not how or by what. Therefore, Collier fails to teach or suggest at least the step of cutting the cable, by the cable-cutting and imprinting machine, to a predetermined length when the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches the predetermined length, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Collier and based on the reasons stated above, is allowable over Collier.

As to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Office Action admitted that Seidler does not disclose cutting the cable to a predetermined length when the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches the predetermined length but alleged that Collier teaches such feature. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because as described above, Collier fails to teach or suggest “cutting the cable, by the cable-cutting and imprinting machine, to a predetermined length when the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches the predetermined length,” as recited in amended Claim 1. As neither Collier nor Seidler teaches or suggests the step of cutting the cable, by the cable-cutting and imprinting machine, to a predetermined length when the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches the predetermined length, the combination of Collier and Seidler fails to teach or suggest each and every element of amended Claim 1. Therefore, it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine these references to achieve the claimed invention.

At least for the reasons stated above, amended Claim 1 is also allowable over Seidler in view of Collier.

As amended Claim 1 is allowable, Claims 2, 6, and 7, which depend from allowable Claim 1, are likewise allowable at least due to their dependency from allowable independent claim and additional features recited therein.

Further, Okamoto also fails to teach or suggest the step of cutting the cable, by the cable-cutting and imprinting machine, to a predetermined length when the cable fed into the cable-cutting and imprinting machine reaches the predetermined length, as recited in amended Claim 1. That is, Okamoto fails to cure the deficiencies of Seidler and Collier. Accordingly, Claims 4 and 5, which depend from allowable amended Claim 1, are likewise allowable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to amended Claim 1.

New Claim 8 recites a process for mounting a plurality of parts to a cable that is to be fixed to a structure at a plurality of portions thereof via at least some of said plurality of parts. Similarly, new Claim 9 recites after cutting and marking the cable and mounting parts to the cable, the method also fixes “the cable to said structure at said plurality of portions by using said plurality of parts.” Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited art teaches or suggests at least the features of Claims 8 and 9, as described above.

Collier merely teaches indicating information on the cable where in a building structure the indicated portions of the cable are to be located and what kind of connectors/devices are to be associated with the indicated portions after the cable is fixed in place in the building structure. No parts are mounted on the cable that would be used as fixing means for fixing the cable to the building structure. Similarly, Seidler discloses a ready-to-use cable. There is no disclosure in Seidler that the cable is to be fixed to a structure at a plurality of portions thereof via at least some of said plurality of parts, as recited in Claim 8 and after cutting and marking the cable and mounting parts

to the cable, the cable is fixed to a structure "at said plurality of portions by using said plurality of parts," as recited in Claim 9.

Based on the above, Applicants respectively submit that new Claims 8 and 9 are allowable over the cited art.


### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-9, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107348.00358.**

Respectfully submitted,  
**ARENT FOX LLP**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Wan-Ching Montfort  
Registration No. 56,127

**Customer No. 004372**  
ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: (202) 857-6000